LIBRARY
SCHOOL
RELIGION

CHAPEL and COLLEGE

SPRING 1960

Our Cover . . .

is by EARL B. PARDON, assistant professor of art at Skidmore College. Mr. Pardon's professional training was received at Memphis Academy of Arts and at Syracuse University.

•

THE measure of a work of art is to be found not only in the intention of the artist, but also in what the observer sees. The editors of **Chapel and College** see in the design of our cover a description of "the Church in the World"— or, if you will, the Church in the Academic Community. It is a living stream which has been described as "flowing into" the places where it is most critically needed—its flow sometimes encouraged, sometimes checked or stopped, sometimes dried up at the source—and "flowing out again" where its mission is fulfilled. This likeness struck the editors before Mr. Pardon's own description of his work was given. Here are his words:

> "The most exciting aspect of art for me is the search for shape or form, and its subsequent discovery, refinement and utilization. Nature is such an enormous warehouse of visual matter. Why should the artist limit his vision to the commonly accepted Narrative of Nature? In fact, I have never produced anything that did not have a similarity, either before or after its conception, to nature. Is the awe-inspiring might of Niagara really any more beautiful than the quiet trickle of a small brook deep in the woods?"

•

In the light of the artist's comment, the editors are aware that they may be superimposing a programmatic interpretation beyond Mr. Pardon's intention. Nonetheless, the temptation to do so is irresistible. And we are struck by the parallel between our interpretation of the cover design as "the church" on the one hand, and the artist's image of "Niagara" and the "quiet trickle . . . deep in the woods" on the other!

CHAPEL AND COLLEGE

SPRING, 1960

Published by the National Association of College and University Chaplains and Directors of Religious Life.

Chapel and College

is published by the National Association of College and University Chaplains and Directors of Religious Life. Its goal is to minister, on behalf of the Association, to its members and to others similarly engaged in the academic community.

It is our editorial policy to contribute uniquely to men and women of our profession in these ways: 1) to explore the underlying theology of and to explicate a philosophy for our mission on the campus; 2) to report religious projects and programs which are being pursued experimentally in the university; and 3) to record worthy examples of the expression of the religious spirit in the college chapel, church or campus religious group.

Publication of **Chapel and College** is made possible through a two-year grant from the Danforth Foundation, to whom the Association here expresses its gratitude.

•

Editor:

GEORGE P. MORGAN, Ph. D., Resident Chaplain
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Editorial Board:

ERNEST GORDON, T. D., LL. D., Dean of Chapel
Princeton University

EDGAR R. SATHER, Chaplain
Skidmore College

RICHARD P. UNSWORTH, Chaplain
Smith College

Editorial Review Committee:

SAMUEL L. GANDY, Ph. D., Dean of Chapel
Dillard University

GEORGE HEDLEY, D. Th., D. D., Chaplain
Mills College

JOSEPH R. SIZOO, S. T. D., L. H. D., LL. D.,
Director of University Chapel
George Washington University

CHAD WALSH, Ph. D., Poet in Residence and
Professor of English
Beloit College

Contents of This Issue

•

SECTION I

"The Basis of Conversation with the Academic Community"
by Bernard M. Loomer ..... Page 5

Responses from the Campus
by L. Paul Jaquith ..... Page 18
by E. C. Reckard ..... Page 23

SECTION II

"Chapel House at Colgate University"
by Kenneth W. Morgan ..... Page 29

SECTION III

"Christianity Versus Religion"
by David A. MacLennan ..... Page 35

Section I

The Basis of Conversation with the Academic Community

By BERNARD M. LOOMER, Ph. D.
the Federated Theological Faculty, the University of Chicago

•

This article was originally given as the second in a series of three lectures at the Annual Meeting and Conference of the National Association of College and University Chaplains, held at Amherst College, April 25 to 29, 1960. Here published in CHAPEL AND COLLEGE, *it is followed by extended comments by two members of NACUC.*

•

IN recent days the church foundations and the "Y" on college and university campuses have been reexamining the reasons for their existence. Initially these organizations were concerned to minister to the religious needs of the students. This is still one of their major preoccupations, with an emphasis on the relations between faith and learning. But the re-definition of their nature and function seems to stress the idea that they exist to serve the university rather than themselves as institutions. It is suggested that as agents of the churches and as representatives of Christian faith they should be devoted to helping the university fulfill itself and become in fact what it is in essence.

This movement among these organizations, if it actually does exist in appreciable magnitude, constitutes a significant shift in emphasis. It also embodies a rather serious indictment of the state of the university. It does not constitute a new or profounder critique of the academic world. But part of the importance of this shift of concern lies in the fact that the "Y" and the church foundations may be **in** the university (or near it) but they are **not of** the university.

They are not of the university because often or normally their existence has an origin independent of the university. They may offer lecture series and courses dealing with the various dimensions of faith and its relations to the several aspects of academic life including the curriculum. But they are not responsible for the basic work of the university, its teachings and research. They are not part of the essential academic and administrative structure of the university, nor are they as institutions usually accountable to the university. They are not involved in the fundamental policy-

making bodies of the academic community. However important their work with students may be in terms of counselling, guidance, religious instruction and activities (and their work is important, partly because the university does not adequately fulfill its functions), nonetheless they are not in the university in the sense of being of the university. They are peripheral institutions attached in a variety of ways to the university.

In re-defining their task these organizations are seeking to discover ways in which they, as institutions external to the university, can aid the university in realizing its true stature. In fulfilling this dimension of their nature they exist in order to go out of business.

Part of the problem of the paper is to determine in what sense the chaplain is not only in but of the university or college. I assume that normally chaplains are officially appointed by the administrative head of the academic institution. (I am talking about chaplains of colleges or universities, not chaplains of church foundations. I am talking about deans of chapels and directors of religious activities.) But, aside from church-related colleges and universities, what is the justification for the appointment of a chaplain? And even in the church-related institutions of higher learning, what is the justification? My purpose in raising this question is not to place chaplains in a defensive position (although the question does have its intrinsic merits), but to enable us to achieve some perspective in dealing with the larger issue of the paper.

As I see it, the chaplain has two related but distinguishable functions in a college or university. In the first function the end is religious. In the second the aim is educational or intellectual. I will deal with each in turn.

I

In his role as chaplain of a college or university a minister's first (and perhaps his primary) concern is with the religious dimension of the educational institution.

This is so in spite of the fact that in no single and unambiguous sense can a school be called a church. This is clearly the case with respect to municipal colleges and state universities. The distinction applies also to church-related colleges, parochial schools and colleges (which may be extension of the churches), and even denominational seminaries (which H. R. Niebuhr has called the intellectual centers of the churches). The churches may have schools. They may originate, control and staff the schools and completely determine the curriculum. But schools as schools are not churches. The focus of one is religious. The aim of the other is educational, even though religion may have educational consequences and education may have religious roots.

I mention this apparent truism in order to accent the notion that the appointment of a chaplain seems to presuppose that the

school as school (whether secular, church-related or parochial) has a religious dimension of some sort. The chaplain may be appointed for a variety of reasons, some of them grounded in basic principles, others related to pragmatic considerations: church-relationship, however nominal, and church-origination; concern for the religious nurture and welfare of the students; public pressure; custom and tradition; public relations; a concern for the "whole person"; educational and/or administrative belief or feeling that it's a good thing; campus ethos; money was given for a chapel, etc. I am not now contending that a college or university should have a chaplain (or a director of religious activities or a dean of chapel), or that our institutions of higher learning should make provision for the exercise of a religious dimension of academic life. Nor am I assuming that there is a religious dimension inherent within the academic enterprise itself, irrespective of whether the institution be public, private, secular, church-related or parochial. In a pluralistic society such as ours, this question is complicated and its discussion would take us far afield. Suffice it to say that the issues involved are not entirely clear and there are few agreed-upon principles. (In most institutions there are particular historical givens and traditions which are operationally determinative in spite of legal complications. The wide spectrum of unique situations makes generalizations difficult.)

But however this may be, the existence of chapels and the appointment of chaplains seem to commit those institutions, in which these conditions obtain, to some form of religious orientation or expression. Obviously this does not mean that all the members of that academic community, whether faculty or student, are committed. But it does mean that the institution in its corporate character has such an obligation.

The central point here is the principle that, in this aspect of the chaplain's work, the basis of conversation with the academic community is the Christian faith itself, or the religious enterprise generally. He is the minister to the congregation, and his parish is the total academic community. The school is not a church, yet he is called to lead the community in its religious expression. His people will include those of different faiths and of no faith, of all degrees of maturity (with its several components), and of all levels of acceptance or rejection of his ministry. The chaplain in this role has a corporate responsibility.

The chaplain's mission in the university is the enhancement of the religious life of the university. His goal is the deepened maturity of religious understanding and expression. By the phrase "religious understanding and expression" I do not mean a way of life and thought isolated from other modes of life and thought, as something self-contained, with its own aseity. Religion does not exist apart from culture. The chaplain obviously has to relate the meaning and nature of faith to the basic substance of human life, in

this instance academic life. But the norm for this aspect of his work is derived from the faith which he presents and embodies and not from the university which he serves. His is the mission of the church to the university for the sake of the church or for the cause of the faith he witnesses to. Like all parish ministers he labors in order that his people may come to know and to live the good news of the more abundant life. In his case his people are academicians of one sort or another. But the decisive standard of what constitutes the abundant life is contained within the message of his faith.

To this end he conducts "religious activities" of many types. He leads worship services and preaches sermons. He is concerned with the religious and moral needs of his people. He deals with the many-faceted personal problems that trouble the members of his flock. In his office he symbolizes the resources available and relevant to the perplexities and ills that afflict the academic spirit. He is not a free-lance counselor. He is a pastoral counselor and theologian.

Working in an academic setting, he has problems peculiar to his situation. Two stand out with some distinctiveness. The first problem consists of the plurality of faiths, religious and secular, present on our campuses. This fact creates difficulties with respect to chapel services in the sense that the pluralistic character of the constituency of the congregation has radically increased in recent years. This means that the chaplain of an academic community must do his work in the context of alternative faiths that must be respected. The relatively easier assumptions of other eras are no longer relevant or adequate. This pluralism gives promise of remaining as a defining characteristic of our situation for the long forseeable future. It presents the chaplain with both a special challenge and a marked sense of limitation. The campus pastor of today must be one who is at home in the inter-faith context of the academic world.

The other peculiar feature of the chaplain's task resides in the nature of the academic life. He has an obligation to interpret the meaning of faith in relation to the intellectual work and life of his people. An adequate discussion of this point would lead directly into an analysis of the chaplain's second function in the academic world. But here I mean to stress the point that because of the peculiar nature of academic people he has a special obligation. In his ministry he is a pastor to those who are (or should be) or who are in the process of becoming intellectually trained, who believe in the importance of ideas, who love and cherish ideas, who believe in the reality of the intellectual life and the work of the mind. To serve in this kind of community, and for the sake of the cause of the faith to which he is committed, the academic chaplain must share in that spirit to an appreciable degree. He need not himself be a scholar in the conventional sense of that term. He need not be a writer of books or monographs. But his ministry must con-

tain a strong intellectual element. Life is not simply intellectual in nature, and faith is not simply reason. But neither is the intellect reducible to something else. The life of the spirit includes the life of the mind.

The chaplain may be fully aware of the foibles and eccentricities of academic people. He may be quite cognizant of the superficiality, dullness, conventionality, shoddiness, emptiness and the generally uncreative character of much of what passes for intellectual work. He may know all this in documented detail. But he must not despise or reject the intellectual life as such. He may hate what he sees, and he may rebel and despair at what goes on. But he must not use this evidence for non-intellectual or anti-intellectual purposes. He must not try to purchase the enhancement of his faith or church at the price of tearing down the intellectual life or the university. This temptation must be resisted especially when, as is so often the case, the intellectual activity seems to be destructive of the basis of faith itself. His despair must be born of the contrast between what the work of the mind often is in practice and what it ought to be and still may be. The despising of things intellectual is treason to both faith and his ministry.

We have talked much about the possible relationships between Christian faith and academic disciplines. But too often we discuss this subject as though faith and reason or faith and inquiry were two foreign bodies that somehow ought to be brought together. But the Christian's love of God and neighbor includes a love of the world. And a love of the world includes a love of ideas and intellectual disciplines that are concerned with the great variety of the realities of the world. Intellectual love is a genuine dimension of our wider and deeper love of God and neighbor. The gifts of wonder and curiosity and the passion for inquiry and understanding can be interpreted as inherent components of the outreach and receptivity of faith itself. Love and faith in their concrete fullness are organic in nature. Because this is so, the intellectual life exemplifies and participates in the fundamental spirit of man. Intellectual love does not encompass the broad scope of the wholeness of love any more than reason adequately defines the totality of man's being. But surely the love of ideas and meanings and a dedication to the discipline of fellowship with them is part of the vitality of man's response to the world of God's creation.

Having said this, I hasten to add that finally the primary and foundational qualifications for an academic ministry are not intellectual, important as this capacity is. Here, as in other forms of the ministry, the chaplain's chief credentials consist in his being as great a human being as his limitations permit and in being a man of faith. Without these, his intellectual gifts and professional skills will not enable him to be a pastor. With these, his intellectual equipment can help him to become more relevant and adequate on the campus. For in the last analysis the chaplain must deal

with his academic people as human beings and not as scholars, or rather with scholars as human beings. This leads us to the second function.

II

The chaplain's second and overlapping function consists of his participation in the contribution that Christian faith can make to the academic enterprise. Here the end is not the cause represented by religion but the enhancement of the college or university. The goal is not religious but intellectual or educational (not that religion is non-educational). His aim, to overstate the matter, is secular. In this aspect of his task the chaplain exists to further the fundamental work of the university; the teaching, the research, and the fundamental process of learning.

The basis of conversation here is not the Christian faith, apart from the fact that many of our educational institutions are not significantly Christian in character (whatever this may mean, both abstractly and concretely). The basis of conversation is the intellectual work of the university, the labor that is distinctive of the university and justifies its existence. The thesis of this section of the paper is that the chaplain's most relevant contribution to the university's mission arises from a primary but not exclusive concern with the human basis of scholarship and the scholar. I am speaking of the chaplain as chaplain, and not in his role as a member of the faculty if he happens also to be a teacher.

Some may feel that the greatest contribution Christian faith can make to the intellectual work of the university is in terms of the implications of the faith for the academic disciplines themselves—with respect to either the content or the methodology of the disciplines. This approach has long been discussed, and it looks better in theory than it often works out in fact. It is a difficult task and it can be undertaken only by those who are competent both in theology and the academic discipline at issue. The fertility of faith in terms of its intellectual consequences and fruitfulness for academic disciplines cannot simply be assumed. In general, the relationship between faith and the work of the mind seems to be more relevant and helpful the closer one comes to the study of man in his social and historical contexts. The more abstract the science, or the greater the distance from the concreteness of man, the less significant appears to be the relationship. This opinion, if it is more true than false, holds with respect to both the content and methodology of the science or discipline involved, especially when we are talking about a direct or immediate confrontation between faith and an intellectual discipline.

From an indirect point of view the situation may be somewhat different. In one sense there is such a thing as an academic discipline in itself. There are a common body of knowledge and a methodology which transcend the individual scholar. The discipline has a reality and objectivity to which the scientists in that field of

study must subject themselves if their work is to be judged as competent. But in another sense there is no such thing as a discipline in itself with its own form of existence. There is no method as such. There are only individual scientists and scholars. They transcend the discipline because they in their work create the discipline, including its content, principles and methodology. The discipline as such is an abstraction from their labor. It exists only in them. From this perspective a particular faith may have been highly efficacious in the shaping of the sensitivity and perceptivity of the scholar who develops a discipline of inquiry.

Christian faith cannot directly determine the conclusions of the inquiries of a discipline. In some studies faith may point to areas of "importance" and indicate the kinds of relevant data. It may suggest possible hypotheses and interpretations of data already present and known from some perspective. Even epistemological and methodological insights may be derived from the content and orientation of faith. In these ways Christian faith may have some implications for various academic disciplines, for faith is not an empty trust in a contentless object. Theology has a content. It makes assertions about the nature of man and his world. It has a vision, and it does deal with knowledge. But on the whole the implications of faith are effective through the conditioning of the person of the man of faith, who is also a practitioner of a discipline, rather than through the discipline itself directly.

In the Whiteheadian sense all disciplines of lesser generality may presuppose a general metaphysical world-view. But within this restriction the disciplines, including theology, do possess an autonomy. This autonomy must be respected. This means that the conclusions of an academic discipline may conflict with the premises of faith. The resolution of these tensions is not obvious.

It is true that a concern for integrity or wholeness is an important contribution of Christian faith to academic life and thought. Faith, as involving the commitment of the totality of man's being to the object of his loyalty, implies system or a coherence between the various dimensions of one's life and thought. In another connection ("The Mind of the University" in **Liberal Learning and Religion,** Wilder, editor) I have spoken of the importance of integrity in a community fragmented by specialized competences. But the realization of wholeness is not easily accomplished any time, especially in the academic world. Those who are concerned about this goal sometimes appear to be not fully aware of the magnitude of the problem. Also, one cannot simply equate specialized competence with the anti-Christ.

In our modern academic world a man is not brought to a faculty primarily because of any interest he may have in "seeing life whole". The philosophic or integrated vision is regarded by most academicians as a luxury and not a necessity with respect to

qualification for membership on a university or college faculty. The prime credential is specialized knowledge and competence. Without this a man is not eligible. Competence involves a reasonable mastery of the basic knowledge and technical tools (including concepts, terms, language and methodology) of a particular discipline. Without these instruments and standards the inquiry is not disciplined. By means of these abilities the scholar is able, theoretically, to make proper distinctions with some precision of thought, to handle difficult problems, and to work with an adequate degree of skill and independence of judgment. Now why is specialization needed?

It is needed, of course, to advance knowledge. Without specialized knowledge, the vastness of the whole domain of knowledge is not manageable. Some of the divisions of labor exemplify a degree of arbitrariness that is not observed in nature itself or in man. Yet we must simplify in order to channel the force of our curiosity and in order to achieve the control that knowledge brings.

Secondly, unless a professor is almost completely externally related to his work, his specialized study reflects the way in which he grasps ideas and meanings as well as the aspect of life or the world about which he is concerned. People understand things in different ways and by means of various media. Some of us think in historical terms, others are at home in abstractions. Still others can grasp the meaning of an idea only when it becomes enfleshed and walks our streets. Other categories could be suggested, and some can operate in two or more modes of thought. With some qualifications it could be maintained that the general divisions in a curriculum roughly correspond to modes of understanding as well as to basic differences in subject matter.

Thirdly, and again assuming some internal relatedness between a professor and his work, specialization represents his calling, his vocation, his passion, the way he will make his contribution to his world. His specialization is a decision (consciously or unconsciously made) as to who he is. This is not simply an intellectual decision. It may well be a human or an existential judgment. It may reflect something of the essence of his being. For within limits a person is his work. In this context a professor's specialized study is the form of his intellectual love, the manner in which he intellectually loves his world. An abiding curiosity that roots in the spirit of a man is an expression of a disinterested love that is emotionally sound and fulfilling. Non-academic people often have difficulty grasping this point. But intellectual love is often very mature in its manner of commitment. The character of our love for our fellows must be commensurate with their worth, dignity and independence. Consequently love has its discipline. In like manner intellectual love has its discipline or order because it honors and respects its subject. Love is a movement toward the other because of the other and our boundaries to him. So with intellectual passion.

Furthermore, specialized competence is a prerequisite for any depth of understanding. Concentrated study is required if something more than a superficial grasp of things is to be achieved. For this reason alone, general education requires the element of focus or specialization. Without this factor of specialized competence our generalizations become loose and undisciplined, illustrating what Whitehead calls the stage of "romance" in contrast to the achievement of precision. Obviously, one cannot acquire depth of understanding or perception if he remains at the survey level.

Finally, integrity or wholeness is not possible without some depth of understanding which in turn requires some specialized competence. The movement toward integrity (which is the only proper possession of wholeness) involves a simplification of life into a relatively small number of foundational principles. But a simplification that is not a gross over-simplification must be grounded upon a deepened grasp of some dimension of life. Specialized competence is like unto a hole that we dig into which we pull the rest of ourselves. A general survey of the fields of knowledge or the several aspects of life, without a perspective of depth forged upon some disciplined and specialized competence, cannot result in a sense of wholeness.

This relation between integrity and specialized competence may take on more significance for us if we recall that ultimately wholeness is akin to system. A system involves coherence among the several elements that make up the system. But system cannot be attained by relating A to B, B to C, C to D, A to C, A to D, B to D, etc. No system is systematically put together in this fashion, and no sense of wholeness is possible on this basis. For the many elements of life and knowledge can be mutually related in an indefinite number of styles. The point is that every system of thought has a key or a set of keys which determines the manner in which the elements are coherently related. This set of keys is composed of the basic insights that underlie the whole system and give it its individual style and character. These determining insights are derived from specialized inquiry involving some depth of understanding. As I indicated before, without this depth and this specialization no vision of wholeness is attainable.

I have given this somewhat extended analysis of the relation between competence and integrity in order to amplify the nature of the problem. Integrity presupposes specialization. But generalizations from one aspect of life may render something less that full justice to other dimensions of thought and experience. The adequacy of a metaphysical system is no greater than the intellectual fullness and fertility of its originating ideas. With some qualifications, a carpenter looks at life through eyes shaped by the requirements of his trade, just as many Negroes too often interpret the whole of life in terms of the conflicts of race relations, and just as the scientist is often inept politically (witness the atom-bomb crusade of the scientists) because the variables of political life do not conform to the neatness and precision of the variables within an equation.

Each of us is a single self. Our nature requires a vision of wholeness and the possession of a core of integrity. This involves specialized competence as a prerequisite for depth of understanding. But specialized knowledge is not the same as wisdom and depth of understanding. And the knowledge derived from one field of concentrated study is not always at peace with other orders of knowledge. Generalizations must be rooted in some one or more special disciplines. And what special knowledge is an adequate basis for the understanding of life's heights and depths? If at this point we press for the relevance of some philosophic vision or religious grasp, how are these to be understood in relation to the several disciplines? I rest the question here, not in order to proof-text the impossibility of a solution but to indicate the magnitude of the task—a task which humbles even the greatest amongst us.

For these and related considerations I conclude that the chaplain can make his best contribution to the academic community **qua** academic in terms of the relevance of Christian faith to the human basis of scholarship and the scholar. To this aspect of the subject I now turn.

To say that life in an academic community is just as real and problematic as anywhere else is not to utter an obvious banality. For this proposition is doubted in many quarters. For example, it is a widespread notion, especially among business men, that academic life is an ivory-tower form of existence. This charge is true, if by "ivory-tower" we refer to the fact that members of a faculty are relieved from pressures that other people are forced to encounter. But by the same definition all styles of life have an ivory-tower quality, business people included, and every group faces pressures that other groups do not meet in the same way or to the same degree. The faculty members who take their task with great seriousness, who theoretically expose their intellectual work to the free criticism of all their colleagues, live under a kind of pressure that few other groups of men must endure. Granted that this pressure is not always generated to its maximum power, and granted that the ideal is at great variance with the prevalent practice and to this extent academic people may be soft and protected. But in their own ways, which may not be so transparent to outsiders, other institutions can be levelled with the same charge.

Academic life has its peculiar temptations, to be sure. It sometimes does exemplify and foster a lack of seriousness, a playing at life. It is filled with illusions. It is often a haven for the esoteric and the irresponsible, the immature and the odd-balls. But I suggest that no form of life, simply in itself and by its very nature, is necessarily more existential in its sense of reality than any other. It depends upon the character possessed by the people involved. Any activity or form of life can be used as an escape or a dream-world. The ivory-tower is not a place, but a condition.

Some of the sterility and emptiness of academic life is rooted in the fact that some academicians do not believe in the existential reality of intellectual work and thereby create their own evidence to support their belief. It is difficult to maintain a steady and unfaltering perception of the reality of academic life because there is so much and impressive evidence to the contrary. But the intellectual life cannot flourish when so many of its exemplars belie its reality, surrounded as they are by a culture which believes neither in its reality nor importance. The fifth column always exists within. The termites are seldom the obvious enemies.

Academic faculties have been defined as communities of scholars. But every experienced chaplain knows that scholars are very human. In these communities we find the characteristics that exist elsewhere: the deep ambiguity of motives, the irritating pettiness, the political scrambling and harsh struggle for power, the inertia and closedness of heart and mind, the jealousy, the inordinate concern for recognition and prestige, as well as great sensitivity, loyalty, dedication, fine generosity, sweet reasonableness, and gracious responsiveness of spirit. There are the examples of greatness, courage, Olympian stature, unexcelled maturity, and integrity. There are also the instances of smallness, cowardice, deep immaturity, and fragmentation of self. There are defeats and victories, failures and successes. Hope, meaningfulness, joy and gladness exist alongside hopelessness, emptiness, sorrow, and sadness. Dullness and brilliance co-exist in the same halls of learning.

The list could be extended, as you know full well. But it should be noted that these are qualities of the spirit and not of the intellect alone. The intellect is not a self-sufficient capability of man. It does not exist by itself. It feeds on man's total self. It is an expression of his spirit. The freedom and power of the mind are reflections of the freedom and power of the self. Those human conditions that release the freedom and creativity of the self will have their consequences in the renewal of the mind. This doesn't mean that the I. Q. of a person can be increased absolutely. But it does mean that a person's potential intellectual strength can be more completely actualized. The respectable and scholarly, but routine, dull, and uncreative quality of much intellectual work is at least correlative to the impoverished, small and fearful human selves that make up the academic community.

The sin and sins of the human spirit have their intellectual entailments. The intellectual biases, prejudices, closedness, rigidity, and sloth, as well as their opposites, have their existential and human roots. And these negative traits are not wholly correctable by intellectual means. There are the political, economic, social, and other institutional obstacles to the fuller realization of academic freedom. But the conditions that block or enhance the practice of free inquiry are by no means solely those that are external to the scholar. They also, and more significantly, exist

within the self. Freedom, in one of its dimensions, is an internal affair, an inner drive or desire. Where it exists it is a hunger of the spirit which external forces can impede but cannot kill. When it does not exist within the self as a personal possession, the restrictions of outside agencies are superfluous. The legal permissiveness with respect to academic freedom is helpful but can only point to freedom as a possiblity. The actualization of inquiry that is free, creative, and prophetic is a matter of existential and personal decision—at least to a determining degree.

One of the basic existentialist categories for the analysis of contemporary life is "nothingness". To put it abstractly, nothingness is a form of non-being inherent in emptiness and meaninglessness. It is the dead center toward which our uncreative and mediocre national ethos moves. It is the cynical banality of our enervating frivolity, our consuming commercialism, and our effortless mockery. Who can deny the hollowness of our tumescent institutions, burgeoning with quantity too excessive for deficient quality to bear? This mood or drift of the spirit is present in our colleges and universities. Professors teach their classes and administrators oil the instruments of academic government. But in all this there is a dry air of nothingness that fills the interstices of our labors. We are not sure whether we struggle with substances or fight with shadows.

For example, we become concerned with the problem of the control of intercollegiate athletics, the commercialization of amateur sports. But the commercialization of sports is paralleled by the cheapening of all our institutions, church, education, and government. Most trades are called professions, and most professions have acquired the defining characteristics of trades. How, realistically, can we abstract from this pervasive mire the institution of intercollegiate athletics and purify its soul? Should we expect the directors of athletics to be more heroic in their resistance to alumni than professors and administrators are in the face of the blandishments of our culture?

The centers of power ought also to be the foci of academic leadership. But administrators are so preoccupied with the omnivorous demands of public relations and fund-raising that it is almost anachronistic to speak about the internal dimensions of their role and task. In point of fact few administrators have any profound understanding of the real nature of internal administration. One suspects that some of them give themselves wholeheartedly to the external obligations in order to escape the realities of the community itself. And leadership of the academic world can be exercised only from the inside. Many question the need for leadership, to be sure. But no level of life can maintain itself at full strength without the living reality of leadership. This is true of academic communities. Even for intellectuals who have great capacities for dealing with abstractions there is no adequate substitute for embodiment or incarnation. Leadership finally resides in people and not in ideas

or ideals however great the power of their attraction. Furthermore, leadership can hardly arise spontaneously in the faculty because it lacks the relevant and necessary power.

The leadership that is the obligation and prerogative of the administrator is both intellectual and pastoral. He is responsible for the initiation and preservation of the great conversation. He may not be the ablest of intellects, yet he can provide conditions whereby the intellectual life of the faculty is strengthened and enlivened. His position confronts him with a challenging intellectual problem: to achieve some kind of integrity as he attempts to incorporate within the unity of himself something of the insights of the members of his faculty. Without this effort the faculty lack an intellectual basis for trust in him. These tasks, if undertaken seriously, require not only energy and ability, but also courage, which is a prime administrative virtue.

His pastoral duties stem from the fact that the members of the faculty are not altogether flowers that grow wild, without being weeded and watered. Like all of us they need to be understood and helped. The ramifications of this role are many, and the analysis could be indefinitely extended. Suffice it to say now that in this pastoral relation the deep and subtle connections between a faculty member's intellectual and personal life are seen most fully.

Given all this and more, what is the role of the chaplain? He exists as a pastor to his people, students, faculty, and administration, so that they may become more greatly human and so that the life and work of the mind may be more abundant. He is an agent of judgment and forgiveness, of understanding and courage, of criticism and reconciliation, of stature and hope, to the end: that the fearful may gain courage, that the blind and ignorant may see and behold, that the tremulous may believe, that the defensive may love and be loved, that the prideful may forget himself, that the defeated may rise from his ashes, that the successful and victorious may be grateful, that the lonely may be received, that all may truly confront themselves and the world with truth and courage, that emptiness may be filled with meaning, that the spirit and mind may be free and strong.

Of course the chaplain will fail. The forces within and without are too powerful for him to handle. Yet he must minister where he can, laboring to help create the university within the university in whatever form this may take.

A Critical Response

to "The Basis of Conversation with the Academic Community"

•

This first critique of Dr. Loomer's article is written by L. Paul Jaquith, Director of Cornell United Religious Work, Cornell University.

•

IN calling attention to the responsibility of the university chaplain for the university as an institution as well as for the individuals who happen to be in the university, Mr. Loomer helps to underscore a concern that is hardly found beyond the avant-garde in the university ministry. Yet, among such there is real readiness to admit but minimal understanding of what it means to witness to the university as well as to the person in the university. But in counseling the university chaplain to concentrate on pastoral work with the persons in the university in the conviction that this is the best way to serve the university, Mr. Loomer seems to align himself with those who charge the church to "stick to religion and stay out of politics and economics". Of course the description of the kind of quality of pastoral concern for the administration qua administration, the faculty qua faculty, and the student qua student is clearly not the irrelevant "soul-saving" enterprise such reactionaries usually have in mind. Yet to leave the impression, as Mr. Loomer seems to do, that a good wall will somehow result from making good bricks, is to minimize the prophetic role of the chaplain in the university. To be sure, the university is far more organic than a wall, even though one confronts unyielding walls—ivy-covered or otherwise—witnin the university. It is, therefore, surely true that the pastoral task, rightly conceived and rightly fulfilled, would go far toward helping the university to become its true self. But much as we need to be reminded of our pastoral responsibility and its implications, the prophetic responsibility of the chaplain is surely just as important. It should go without saying, perhaps, that to speak of prophetic and pastoral is not to speak of antithetical or even distinctively separate-but-complimentary tasks of the chaplain, but to use the current imagery, two dimensions of the same basic task.

The university as an organic community, as an institution, belongs to God every bit as much as the individuals who comprise the university, and there is a sense in which the university is "man writ large". The university stands in need of redemption even as does each man. The university has corporate assumptions about truth,

about man, about the good life, whether conscious or unconscious. The policies and practices of the university, whether in dorm hours, construction priorities or curriculum structure, determine whether the university is being its true self or succumbing to the bargaining pressures Mr. Loomer vividly warns against. The university, even as man, can be said to be a worshiping creature in that it aspires to, bows before, judges itself by, requests of, and gives itself to goals, norms (gods) of its choosing. These gods are either real or they are not. Part of the training of the chaplain is to discern the difference between the God who is God and pretexts to God.

Perhaps Mr. Loomer borders on despair at the point of the university ever being truly a university—ever fulfilling God's image of a university (if one can speak of such). He certainly cautions against optimism in the substantial relating of theology and other academic disciplines, though I am convinced that with sustained and careful effort, some of us, even without being renowned specialists in a given discipline, can help very much to bring the disciplines of theology on the one hand and those of psychology and sociology, law and education, for example, on the other hand, at least within shouting distance of one another. And on some campuses this would be a real gain. There are those who border on despair, too, at the point of individual man ever reflecting in unqualified manner, the glory of God. I believe there is no less reason to hope that a university may one day be truly a university than to hope in a man one day truly becoming a man.

But Mr. Loomer seems not so much to stress salvation of the individual over the corporate life, as to press the view that the way to reach the corporate is through the individual. My point is that this is only a half-truth. The head of a department may not be free to express himself even if fully man, if he is caught in and chooses to remain in a web of pressures and circumstances ("principalities and powers") which are more complex than simply another prideful or slothful person. There are traditions, policies, budgets, organizational weak-links, short-circuits and bottlenecks within the impersonal structure of the university. And these are often beyond the power of any one man to change, however "whole" such a man may be. There are committees, groups and sequences of individuals to be addressed, and sometimes efforts to be made which are not simply speaking to other individuals or groups, efforts which may change campus temper and university character. Mr. Loomer is far more acquainted with this dimension of university life than I, but the point is that it does not seem quite adequate to subsume responsibility for the corporate life of the university under responsibility for the individual within the university, even though we address the corporate through the individual. Alongside the addressing of the individual in the context of the corporate must be the addressing of the corporate through the individual. And this would seem to call for the prophetic word as much as for the pastoral.

But even more serious is the far too facile separation of the "religious" and the "educational" tasks of the university chaplain in Mr. Loomer's analysis. Even granting a narrow, rather sociological definition of religion (by which one means readily identifiable ritual and certain acknowledged motivation) on the one hand, and a completely secular definition of education on the other, to suggest that a chaplain is grounded in the Christian faith* in his "religious" responsibility and must accept the secular justification of education in his "educational" task is to push him into a schizophrenic grave in denial of his singular calling and his sovereign Lord.

In the first place, I would urge abandonment of the term "religious" to describe the more priestly or pastoral task as over against the educational or intellectual task. The fact that a university may have a secular definition of its task does not mean that a chaplain must accept this definition as his own in accepting the university as the place of his ministry. In the perspective of Christian vocation, in the classic Protestant understanding of the term, the chaplain may see the task of inquiry after truth as no less sacred, no less religious than the task of worship of the Truth. And both belong in the life of a real university. Along with the search to master truth is the search by which truth masters us. And neither need be more secular or more religious than the other, as the university chaplain views the basis of his conversation with the university. The perspective set forth by Mr. Loomer may be the way a secular administrator might understand the role of chaplain in the university, but it could hardly be the understanding a Christian chaplain would have of his role.

Perhaps it would help to express the concern for the undivided, singular calling of the chaplain and to preserve the validity of both tasks (or both forms of the same task) if we spoke of the ministry (or service) of the university chaplain as expressed in both priestly and pedagogical forms. Perhaps to stress his earlier point that the university is not the church (and with this we could hardly quarrel), and, further, to point out the need to keep the academic enterprise free from ecclesiastical control (here we also heartily agree), Mr. Loomer separates the "educational" from the "religious" responsibility of the chaplain. My point is that this dichotomy is not necessary in order to preserve the distinction between church and university nor even to retain academic freedom. The chaplain may understand his calling under God, even his role within the church, to be as much to "further the fundamental work of the university: the teaching, the research, and the fundamental process of learning", as the "enhancement of the religious life of the uni-

* It is not clear whether Mr. Loomer means by "faith" in his paper, tradition, commitment, or both, though it would seem most often to mean both, in which case an ambiguity is perpetuated since the term is often used today to connote either tradition or commitment, but seldom both.

versity . . . (his goal being) the deepened maturity of religious understanding and expression." Of course the chaplain's ordination commits him to a responsibility for the latter that he does not thereby have for the former, but his calling as a Christian within the university need make no such distinction. But even if one understood his ordination vows to commit him to the "religious" over the "educational" life of the university he need not resort to secular justification for his concern and involvement in the academic life of the university. (Again, as Mr. Loomer suggests, the chaplain's involvement in the academic life may or may not include his formal teaching.) The God of our biblical and churchly heritage is Lord both of the university and of the church and is the object of our inquiry as He is the object of our worship, and this fact is not contingent upon its being thus understood in any given situation. Mr. Loomer is undoubtedly concerned, and rightly so, that the chaplain's involvement in the academic affairs of the university not be exploitive in character, in the interest of a kind of narrow religious concern or in any sense at all, for that matter. (Earlier, we implied an objection to the use of the term "religious" in this sense as normative.) It is fear on the part of many faculty that the chaplain's interest in academic affairs is of just this abortive sort that is perhaps the chaplain's greatest obstacle in talking man-to-man with faculty about the academic enterprise. A chaplain who makes the point in a faculty committee, that removal of the compulsory requirment of ROTC courses would make possible greater academic quality in the university's curriculum, may stand squarely on the ground of the Christian faith (tradition and commitment) whether his colleagues recognize it or not. He may be as much concerned that the university fulfill its calling as he is that the church fulfill her calling, and his concern for both, as a university chaplain, may be a singular and inseparable concern.

We are not here taking issue with Mr. Loomer's suggestion of how the chaplain expresses his concern "in terms of the revelance of the Christian faith to the human basis of scholarship and scholar", for there is very helpful insight here, but we are concerned primarily with the perspective in which the chaplain works in the university, for this is the basis of his conversation with the university. The perspective need not—indeed must not—be bifocal.

It might be helpful to speak of the chaplain's **ministry** as that of enhancing the religious life of the university, and of his **mission** as the enhancing of the life of the university, but neither being incompatible with the other nor mutually exclusive of the other. Ministry and mission are, normatively, inseparable dimensions of a singular calling. The ministry is primarily, though not exclusively, to the community of faith, and the mission is primarily, though not exclusively, to the community of learning. Though the chaplain need not stand on different ground, fundamentally, his stance may differ relative to the community which he addresses. Some things he can

assume about his hearers when addressing the community of faith he cannot assume about his hearers when addressing the community of learning, even though these may often be the same people. He must take cognizance of the context in which he finds his hearers. Perhaps what Mr. Loomer is saying, to oversimplify, is that there are times when the chaplain must preach and there are times when he must teach, and the stance appropriate to each is decidedly different. My point is that while this is surely true, one need not stand on different ground to change his stance. The topic concerns the basis of conversation, not the mode of conversation, and it seems to me this distinction is either not clear in Mr. Loomer's paper, or he is speaking of a dual basis which is not acceptable in the Christian perspective.

Having expressed sketchily these two major criticisms of the paper, it would not be fair to overlook the great strengths of the paper, nor to fail to express appreciation for Mr. Loomer's contribution to our understanding of the chaplain's role in the university at a number of points.

The description of the pastoral role of the chaplain is one which catches many of us napping. And the suggestion that this is perhaps the role most clearly seen and justified on the part of the administration is not to be overlooked. The reminder that the university is not the church, but that the appointment of a chaplain and the presence of a chapel commit the university in a corporate fashion to share something of the concern of the church for its own life, raises some basic questions as to what this means. When the university's commitment, much less its constituency, is not predominantly Protestant, must the worship life of the university be essentially Protestant in order to have integrity as worship, or can a religiously heterogeneous university find valid ways of expressing its corporate life before God which are not distinctively rooted in any one tradition within our biblical heritage? We will be wrestling with this question for some time to come, for yesterday's answers to this question are not necessarily today's.

The pastoral role of the chaplain will have validity only as it is somehow bound up with the prophetic role, and the prophetic role will have validity only as it is somehow bound up with the pastoral role. The pastoral has been associated with the individual; the prophetic, with the corporate. In emphasizing the pastoral and the personal, as Mr. Loomer has done, let us not overlook the prophetic and the corporate dimensions of our ministry and our parish. Further, both the priestly and the pedagogical roles, while neither one depends so much on the other, must be seen as expressions of the same calling under the same Lord, even while preserving the distinction between worship and inquiry and the respective integrity of each.

Comments

on "The Basis of Conversation with the Academic Community"

•

The second response to Dr. Loomer's article is made by E. C. Reckard, Chaplain of the Associated Colleges of Claremont.

•

PROFESSOR LOOMER'S description of the chaplain's role is perceptive and stimulating; it is also humbling to anyone who attempts the vocation he describes. For chaplains who heard or read this paper, therefore, it is both a helpful and a chastening exercise. I shall at best be reacting to a few of his main points in the comments which follow.

1. The dimensions of the chaplain's task, especially as they are summarized in the latter paragraphs, are so extensive and demand qualities so marked that this analysis becomes a judgment on all who undertake this role. The disparity between the scope of the description and the likely performance of a chaplain is so great, in fact, that it raises some question as to the accuracy of the description. Mr. Loomer compliments the vocation highly by his description, and the chaplain should no doubt press his aspirations in its direction. Nevertheless, the enterprise of criticism, enrichment, and reconciliation described is, in fact, the vocation of the entire Christian community and of all members of this community within the university and not of the chaplain alone. To assign it to the chaplain alone not only detracts from the dignity and responsibility of the other members of the Christian community but it also encourages unrealistic expectations of the chaplain on the part of college administrators, denominational officials, and even of the chaplain's Christian colleagues within the university.

2. The chaplain can hope, at best and at times, to be the focus of and administrative instrument for some of these tasks. This points up again, however, the importance of Mr. Loomer's emphasis on the chaplain as being not only **in** but also **of** the college or university.

To perform these tasks, he needs to be, perhaps must be, **of** the university. But to be **"of the university"**, in many important but sometimes subtle ways, is a status which cannot be defined simply in terms of official administrative appointment, although such appointment may be a desirable or even necessary condition for being "of the university", at least in terms which most college faculty members

would accept. For them, to be **of** as well as **in** the university means to have some competence for, to be committed to, and to participate in "the basic work of the university, its teaching and research." (Loomer, paragraph 3.) This does not mean, in every instance, that the individual must be engaged in classroom teaching and scholarly research. But it does mean that he understands and values such activities, and increases their effectiveness by his own part in the community's life. Clearly all administratively appointed officials at a university are not **of** the university in this sense. The superintendent of buildings and grounds, for example, would qualify rarely if ever in these terms. The campus doctor is a more ambiguous case. Most of us know examples of the college physician or psychiatrist who is clearly **of** the college; for the most part, however, they are merely **in** the college. The responsibilities of the latter could be discharged by any medically competent person; but the rarer, former type can bring to the whole campus community a dimension in understanding itself and its work which is unique.

So, too, with the chaplain: official appointment is no guarantee of being **of** the university except in a narrow administrative sense. But it offers the possibility that the chaplaincy may become deeply a part of the basic work of the university. It can never be so, however, if the understanding that the chaplain has of his role is defined in such a way as to be irrelevant or merely additional to the basic work of the university. Whatever he is to bring to its life must have its relationships to and its ground in the basic work, the teaching and research; otherwise it is doomed to be only **in**, not **of**, the university.

This distinction opens up the possibility, of course, that being **of** the university in this sense may extend, in part at least, to those who are not administratively appointed by the university nor **directly** involved in its policy-making. This status is sometimes enjoyed, for example, by an artist or writer living in the neighborhood of a university. This may also be true, however rarely, of a neighboring clergyman, denominational student worker, or SCA secretary. But for them this becomes possible only if they are willing to enter voluntarily into some of the ambiguities of an official appointment, a sense of responsibility in enforcing policy and of discretion in discussing it, a sense of loyalty to the institution and its staff, a sense of concern for **all** its students, and the rest.

This is a long way of saying that official administrative appointment is perhaps the least of the qualifications a chaplain must offer in order to be **of** the university, and that the absence of such appointment may not, at least in some cases, be an insuperable barrier to such blessed status.

3. These observations could usefully lead to a consideration in detail of the advantages and disadvantages of such appointments, for clearly both are present. This consideration cannot be attempted

here, except to say that it is the writer's conviction that such an attempt would indicate more clearly the advantages accruing from official appointment; it would also indicate some of the conditions of appointment that are necessary for the chaplain's fullest effectiveness. This clarification should be welcomed by the chaplains, by the colleges which appoint them—presumably for some useful purposes—, and by the churches. And this last is of great importance.

For there is no area of greater ambiguity in the field of the college chaplaincy than in the relationships of the churches to it. This reflects itself in at least two ways: (a) the churches have not fully assessed the college chaplaincy and its status in the total ministry of the church. The result is that the chaplaincy is marked for many men by vocational uncertainty and professional frustration. (Something of the same thing is true in the armed services chaplaincies too.) There is a consequent steady loss of college chaplains to the fields of teaching, college administration and personnel work, community services and foundations, and the like. In many cases this is a proper change, both from the point of view of the individual and of his denomination. In many others, however, it is clearly a function of his feeling somehow extraneous to and cut off from the purposeful life of his denomination; it needs hardly be said that this is a loss to both the individual and his denomination.

(b) But the loss to all becomes even more marked in the light of Mr. Loomer's remarks about the "dry air of nothingness" that characterizes so much of the life of contemporary colleges. For it is into this void that the chaplain seeks to bring what he can of that which is required in order that faculty and students "may become more greatly human and so that the life and work of the mind may be more abundant." This effort requires resources which cannot be created merely by sustained and serious individual effort. (The fact is that they will not be brought to the university solely by the efforts of isolated individuals in any case.) One would expect that the chaplain might find a source of corporate spiritual strength and even perhaps of intellectual insight by his involvement in the community of the church. But the fact is that it is more difficult for the chaplain (and for the ordained professor of religious studies) to find his natural and helpful place in the corporate life of the church than it is for his lay professional colleague! Thus the chaplain is often cut off from whatever resources of the churches' life he is most strategically placed to interpret and transmit to the colleges. The churches are in the same way cut off from those who might at times most relevantly interpret to them the life of the colleges.

To all denominations which utilize and cherish some type of institutional discipline and control of its clergy—and which do not? —it is a cause of uneasiness and suspicion (or even of alarm) that their clergy should be professionally involved in appointments and responsibilities which lie in large measure outside of their direct control. Perhaps this is a prohibitive condition on the work of any

clergyman. If so, this fact would be more clearly displayed by the analysis of advantages and disadvantages here suggested, and appropriate action could then be taken. Presumably this would be the withdrawal of permission to continue in good standing as a clegryman of that denomination while serving in a college chaplaincy. But if this is not necessarily and under all circumstances a prohibitive condition, as I think it is not, then such an analysis might lead to the kind of understanding on the part of church, college, and chaplain which would relate the churches and the colleges more fruitfully to each other and increase the effectiveness of a chaplain who shared fully in the life of each.

This line of argument does not in any way assume that all colleges and universities either could or should have chaplains. This is a decision which must be left to the colleges themselves, except in the case of denominational colleges and even here the decision is probably best made by the college. Such an analysis would indicate to the college more clearly what was involved in its decision, either way. Such an analysis of the college chaplaincy as is here suggested might also reveal more clearly to the denominations what is involved in a ministry from "outside" to those colleges which do not have chaplains, so that this ministry might hopefully become of the college. It could hardly help to throw light on the nature and function of the college ministry of the denominations and to increase its effectiveness.

Anyone who shares the life of both church and college can hardly be unaware of the often unconscious tensions and suspicions that exist between them. That this condition should contiue unexamined and unresolved is an unfortunate loss to the life of both. Dr. Loomer's paper may perhaps stir some among us to seek to end this unnecessary and, for the churches at least, shameful situation.

Section II

Chapel House at Colgate University

By KENNETH W. MORGAN, L. H. D.

•

Kenneth Morgan is Professor of Religion and Director of the Division of the Humanities at Colgate University. Out of his interest in the religions of man was born the meditation center described here—Colgate's Chapel House. An unique experiment, so far as we know, it is "not a conference center nor a rest home." It is there to provide the "time to meditate and pray . . . to become quiet again." There you will find "gurus *in the books, the music, the works of art."*

•

IN the spring of 1959 we opened at Colgate University a new religious center where anyone, of any faith or none, who wants to take the initiative in seeking a deeper insight into religion is welcome. It was created on the premise that those who wish to gain a deeper understanding of religion should study the ways in which religious people have expressed their insights—in books, works or art, and music—and should have time in silence for meditation and prayer. Chapel House was designed to provide those facilities for anyone who wants to use them.

Chapel House is located on a hill overlooking the Chenango Valley, only a few minutes walk from the center of the Colgate campus. The architecture is modern, for no traditional religious architecture could be used lest it be misunderstood as an imitation of a traditional institution. It is not a monastery, retreat house, *schule, madrasa, tekke*, nor an eclectic attempt to imitate such worthy institutions. We could not use Gothic, Georgian, Islamic, or Zen architecture without being misunderstood, so we built modern buildings designed to serve the functions required of them. The firm of Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill of New York accepted our challenge to create a Chapel and a House which would be in themselves works of religious art, built to "speak their own piece" so anyone entering them would undestand what we are doing at Chapel House. The hundreds of visitors during this past year have testified that the architects succeeded. Visitors come with little idea of what such a center might be, suspicious that it is a bit lunatic, and go away saying that the beauty of the Chapel and the quiet of the House make clear what we are trying to do—and the importance of the undertaking.

The end walls of the Chapel are rough stone, the side walls are amber cathedral glass in panels from the floor to the roof, with double walls of glass so the light will be diffused in the interior and so the lights between the panels of glass will illuminate the walls at night. At the front of the Chapel is a reredos of Italian mosaic in a random pattern of brown and gold, with a large wooden cross extending from the floor to the ceiling.

The cross is the only symbol in the Chapel. Although the Chapel is designed to be used by people of all faiths, the Cross was put there to make it clear that those who created the Chapel are Christian, and we want anyone who uses Chapel House to be equally forthright in declaring his faith. We do not seek to encourage use on the basis of the lowest common denominator, but hope that everyone who comes to Chapel House will follow his own path without restraint. If anyone wishes to use the Chapel without the symbol of the cross, a curtain can be pulled in front of the reredos and the room can be used with no symbol, or with any other symbol the worshipper wishes to place there.

The room can be used for small groups. There is an altar which can be placed in front of the reredos, and a pulpit for the leader. An ark is being built for the Sabbath services of the Jewish students. The primary use of the Chapel is for individual meditation, however. The chairs were designed for meditation, with arms, a comfortable seat, and straight backs. The chairs in the back row are placed in stalls, with partitions between them which project far enough to give privacy, making one unaware of others in the room at the same time. Behind the stalls are two oratories with curtains which can be drawn for complete privacy; on the oratory altars the worshiper may place any symbol of his choice.

The House is connected to the Chapel with a clear glass link, making it possible to leave the Chapel open to the public at all times, even when the House is in use by people who wish to keep silence. The House has a library, a music room, a dining room, and seven bedrooms.

The library has a collection of about 3,000 books on the Bible, Christian history, theology and philosophy; devotional books and books on religious disciplines; Protestantism, Catholicism, Judaism; ancient religions; comparative religion, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Taoism, Confucianism, and other religions of the world; literary criticism, novels, essays, poetry; art and music. The books have been selected to serve the needs of anyone who is seeking a deeper insight into religion. It is not a research library designed for scholarly studies, but a library for personal use. Guests may take the books to the Chapel or their rooms, but may not take the books from Chapel House.

The music room has an excellent stereophonic phonograph and a large collection of recorded religious music covering all types of music and as many religions as possible. There one can take the time to try to understand the religious insights expressed in gospel hymns, Gregorian chants, requiems, the Mass, the Jewish Sabbath services, Buddhist services, and the whole range of religious music.

In the House we have as many examples of religious art as we have been able to get to show how through painting and sculpture men have sought to express their religious insights. We have a Mestrovic figure of Christ on the Cross, an 8th century Kwan Yin from China, Buddha images from China, Japan, Burma, and Thailand; a bronze Silence by Alfeo Faggi; rubbings from temple sculpture in Angkor, Thailand, and China; two Rouaults; Tibetan Thangkas; Japanese scrolls and calligraphy; a portrait of Confucius sent up from a Confucian University in Korea; and several Hindu images. Some visitors are shocked to see such works of religious art juxtaposed, for they wish to see only examples from their own faith, but all who come to Chapel House are compelled to recognize that men of all faiths have expressed their religious insights through art, and many of our guests realize for the first time their need for more understanding of religious art.

The resident facilities have been provided because it takes time to study the books, listen to the music, and become familiar with the works of art provided there, and time to meditate and pray; it takes time to become quiet again. At Chapel House the guests may come for only a few hours, or may stay a few days, or weeks, so long as they find their time well spent. The bedrooms are small private rooms, each with its own bath, assuring complete quiet and privacy. In the dining room we serve simple meals for resident guests.

Anyone who wants to use the facilities of Chapel House is welcome, whether from our own campus or community, or from any other. We only ask that the guests do not bother each other. They spend their time reading, listening to records, studying the works of art, and meditating and praying either in their rooms or the Chapel. There is no fixed schedule except the time for meals. There is no instruction offered, but questions are willingly answered. One Buddhist Bhikkhu who stayed at Chapel House said that we must have a *guru*, a teacher, to tell the guests what to do, but we pointed out that no one *guru* would be acceptable to all the people who come, and anyway, we provide our *gurus* in the books, the music, the works of art. Those who cannot find their teachers in books, music, and art, and those who cannot follow their own disciplines of meditation and prayer, will discover that Chapel House is not for them.

Chapel House is not a conference center nor a rest home. Basically, it is used by individuals who are willing to take the initiative themselves. Sometimes, however, several individuals prefer to come

together. Several times this past year we have had groups of students come for a weekend, beginning Friday afternoon and continuing through Sunday afternoon. At such times we explain to them the facilities and after that they go their own ways, keeping silence except at meal times. We have had students from Wells, Cornell, Skidmore, Colgate, and Yale Divinity School. It is our hope that more schools will come in the future and especially that the theological school students will discover their need for periods of time at Chapel House during the years of their graduate study.

The Chapel has been used for communion services by the Lutheran students and other Protestant groups. Jewish Sabbath services have been held in the Chapel several times. The Catholic students had an instructional Mass in the Chapel. Friends Meeting is held there every Sunday morning. But the chief use of the Chapel is for individual meditation and prayer.

The first guest at Chapel House, last spring while there were still workmen about, was a Buddhist Bhikkhu from Burma, U Thittila. He came soon after arriving in this country for a lecture tour, returned a few weeeks later for a weekend, and toward the end of his stay in this country came back again for a full week. We have had guests from Burma, Tibet, India, England, and Canada, and from many sections of the United States during our first year. The guests have been men and women, Jews, Catholics, Protestants, Hindus, Buddhists, Muslims, laymen, clergymen, monks, students, and professors.

The testimony of the guests has been that the experience of silence, study, meditation, and prayer has been far more valuable than they had anticipated. Although their backgrounds have been quite diverse, they have felt at home, in Quaker parlance "comfortable", in Chapel House. Catholic, Jew, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist, and Muslim have all testified that Chapel House has been for them a place of spiritual renewal.

Anyone who wishes to stay at Chapel House should write to Chapel House, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York, for a reservation. The ordinary charge for a room and three meals is three dollars a day, but special arrangements can be made for those who cannot afford to pay. Chapel House welcomes anyone who wants to use the books in the library, to play the records in the music room, to study the works of religious art, or to spend some time in the Chapel in prayer or meditation. It expects the person who comes to Chapel House to follow his own initiative, to study, to meditate, or pray according to his own religious preference. It expects the residents who stay overnight to remain not less than forty-eight hours, for a shorter residence is inadequate. All we ask is that the guests of Chapel House use the facilities for the purpose for which they are intended and do not bother each other.

Section III

Christianity Versus Religion

By DAVID A. MacLENNAN, Minister
the Brick Presbyterian Church, Rochester, N. Y.

•

This sermon was given in Rollins Chapel, Dartmouth College, on the occasion of an Intercollegiate Convocation, November 16, 1958. The Convocation was addressed to the question of "Education for Moral Responsibility."

•

Lesson: Galatians 1:1-12

> "I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting him who called you in the grace of Christ and turning to a different gospel —not that there is another gospel, but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. But even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed."
> Galatians 1:6-8 (RSV)

VEN in modern houses—including those young architects somewhat snobbishly call "modren"—there are fireplaces. On a chilly evening last summer in a friend's summer cottage on the Maine coast, we ruminated about fireplaces. Often beside a fireplace is a set of beautiful fireplace tools, in shining brass. My host reminded me of something you have also observed. Quite often the owner of the house and of the shining tools does not use the bright tools to do anything to the fire. When the fire needs to be poked, he reaches around the corner and gets a dirty little iron poker, and does the job with that. In like manner, "our popular religion, including our high ideas, are like the shining brass instruments, looks well by the fire, but when there is a practical job to be done, we use something less beautiful."

Religion in America may be leveling off as far as church attendance goes, but it still stands at an all-time high in popularity. Six out of ten Americans belong to a church or synagogue. Churches once empty are filled. A few years ago only our separated brethren of Rome held two, three or more Sunday morning services. Today in cities, only very large Protestant sanctuaries built in an earlier generation hold one morning service; most churches have two or three morning services. Religious books once forlorn, and lonely on back shelves are displayed in front windows. Some lead best seller lists. In the last decade pesudo-religious motion pictures and popular songs have led the hit parade. To quote a **Christian Century** writer using unacademic idiom, "the popular music was

hep to the Gospel beat." "Religious appeals in public discussions and political addresses seem to be on the increase and cannot be entirely dismissed as a lure to catch the church vote . . . Some observers have seen in these events the signs of imminent revival. Others have dismissed them with cynicism. The true meaning is difficult to assess." (See Ronald E. Osborn, **The Spirit of American Christianity,** pages 210, 211.) More than in several generations we may witness a return to religion. I have been warned by Professor Edward Farley of De Pauw University (**Christian Century,** December 10, 1958) that it may be too easy for a critic to climb on the bandwagon on which ride those who almost insist that "one must somehow be 'against' the religious revival in order to be a Christian." We need to be reminded that there is danger in this "new version of the we-they philosophy . . . we who have the gospel arising in prophetic fire against mass culture which obviously does not have it."

But there IS a distinction between Christ and culture. There is a difference between popular religion and biblical Christianity. One analyst noting that sixty per cent of our citizens belong to some church also notes that in the same period of the churches' most striking growth, crime has risen sixty per cent.

It may seem to some bewildering, to others rude and ungrateful for any religious person to flash caution lights before the rolling bandwagon of popular religion. But couldn't it be that in our era as in earlier periods, conventional religion is like the shining brass fireplace implements? It looks well after a polish—weekly, monthly or semi-annually. But when a practical job is to be done? When the heat is on, or our morale needs stoking up?

Thus, we say and may say sincerely, "In God we trust". It is the official motto of our nation. Perhaps wisely it does not specify in what God we trust. But as we move into the space-age, make what is called "lunar thrusts", in what, in whom do we really believe? The God of the biblical revelation, the great and gracious God revealed in many ways, but supremely in the total fact of Jesus Christ? Or do we confide in our technology? Of course we believe in God, who is holy, righteous love. Love is "the greatest" . . . agape-love, of course. Love your enemies is a shining idea. But in times of conflict, tension, difficult persons, we reach around for a dirty little poker. The Christian ethic is lovely and luminous, but force is quicker. To quote the prophet, James Thurber, "Yes, Virginia, there is a bomb in Gilead, but don't just take another tranquilizer and walk the other way. Let's face it . . ."

When Christianity was young the church faced similar temptation. Paul wrote one of his strongest, most finished letters to those who professed to be Christians but who had watered down the faith. These were the men and women who lived in the Roman district called Galatia. The Galatian Christians seem to have been seduced from their first faith by teachers who insisted that they must still

keep the old Jewish law. Here is Paul's response to this return to what was at once more legalistic and more comfortable: "I am amazed that you have so quickly transferred your allegiance from Him who called you in the grace of Christ to another gospel!" Paul was being intolerant. But he was intolerant of a distorted, diluted version of the faith. Popular religion whether it provides a code of comfortableness is actually less demanding. "It gives me great joy, Mrs. Brown," said an Aberdeen parish minister, "to see you always in your pew on Sabbath day." "Indeed, sir, I'm real glad to come, for it's not often I get such a comfortable seat and so little to think about." Today there are more comfortable seats than those in churches. But the implication bites: does "the comfort of a cushion mean more than the compulsion of Christ's cross"?

I. We need more than popular religion; **We need a dynamic Christian faith, biblically based, to make sense out of this ambiguous life.**

In Thomas Wolfe's play, "Look Homeward Angel," Ben's death causes his seventeen-year old brother to look upward and pray, "Whoever you are, be kind to Ben tonight." Is this the best we can conceive—"a vague Somebody or Someone upstairs"—"whoever you are"? We are admonished to have faith. In what? In whom? In ourselves, in humanity, in America, in technology? Have faith in faith? "I didn't know you believed in astrology," said a friend to an actress. "Oh, yes, I believe in everything—a little bit."

"I did not receive it," wrote Paul in verse 11 and 12, "nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ." This is the audacious claim of the Gospel. Ours is a revealed faith. Discovery is the manward side of the revelation. Before we called He answered. It is not a projection of our needs, fears, hungers. All history seems to prove that this interpretation, this disclosure, came from God.

II. **We need more than conventional religion to deal realistically with our basic failure, with the sense of guilt associated with it.** I think now not of violations of conventional morality. These are not lightly to be dismissed but these are symptoms, expressions of the deeper fact of our separation from God. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins to deliver us . . ." A London newspaper had a contest, "What's wrong with the world?" A famous writer sent the briefest answer. "Dear Sir, What is wrong with the world? I am Yours, G. K. Chesterton." As Martin Luther and many other study reformers saw, "Sin is such a tangle that man cannot deal with it. Only God can straighten it out . . . The Cross of Christ points to how far God will go to make us free." Much popular religion lacks this dimension and fails to deal deeply with our fundamental wrongness.

III. **You and I need more than popular religion to be responsible citizens in our society.** Confronted with global problems which run

from our back door and then back again to our front door, we need something more than "the hurrying greedy success" before which civic standards go down. As Robert Hutchins said caustically, we cannot live "bathed in the warm milk of togetherness, lost in trivial adoration, pass our lives vicariously vigorous, active and courageous watching Westerns." Let me read you an editorial which should be often reprinted. **The San Francisco Chronicle** ran it, some months ago.

> "A cruel and sudden crisis charged with feeling confronted Cecil Poole, Assistant District Attorney, one morning last week. At its peak, Poole fashioned a few short words into a simple declarative sentence that for aptness and eloquence no novelist, no professional builder of phrases, could far excel after long thought and much revision. Poole is a Negro. He lives in Ingleside Terrace, a 'white' neighborhood. Thus shock, bewilderment, and regret and mixtures of a dozen other emotions must have surged through him when his six-year old daughter came running into the house to report, 'There's a cross on our lawn—all burned.' And with the news she brought a troubled question, 'Why is it there?' Such a question under such conditions needed a meticulous answer. Poole found this answer. We think it is a perfect one. It invites thought and bears frequent repetition. 'Some Christian has lost his way.' "

Thank God, Christians can find the way again. For there is not where Christ is not. But it will take all there is of us living, thinking, acting from a great depth of being "in Christ".

Surely the Christian answer is, "Yes, with God all things are possible." But we are to "work out our salvation with fear and trembling" (Phillips: "with a proper sense of awe and responsibility") remembering constantly that "God is at work in you, both to will and to work for his good pleasure." (Philippians 2:12.)

As Dr. Raymond B. Fosdick, the former director of the Rockefeller Foundation, wrote in his autobiography, "The towering enemy of man is not his techniques, but his irrationality; not silence, but war. Can tolerance and understanding and creative intelligence run fast enough to keep us in line with our mounting capacity to destroy?" I would not oversimply the answer. But I am persuaded that the most important factor in the answer is Christianity in depth and breadth. Is not the essential movement of the gospel—"down and out"? "Down" from God to us in self-giving love; then, as that love changes and controls us, "out"—into the world where we live?

O God our Father, who hast placed us in this creative age, grant us thy grace of wisdom, of courage, of love, that we may be used by thee not only to explain but to change the world, through the power of Christ. **Amen.**

NACUC Officers--1960-61

•

President ..... Robert H. Beaven
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York

Vice President ..... Carleton L. Lee
Central State College
Wilberforce, Ohio

Association Secretary ..... James N. Nesmith
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee

Membership Secretary ..... Norman B. Johnson
Union College
Schenectady, New York

Treasurer ..... John M. Currie
Lafayette College
Easton, Pennsylvania

Chairman of Public Relations ..... Daniel W. Wynn
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, Alabama

Editor of "Chapel and College" ..... George P. Morgan
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York

Chairman of Information Service ..... Bradford S. Abernethy
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Past President ..... Theodore S. Darrah
Rollins College
Winter Park, Florida

Historian ..... Charles C. Noble
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Prout Printers
TROY, N.Y.

Return Postage Guaranteed

•

Chapel and College

EDITOR, OFFICE of the RESIDENT CHAPLAIN
RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
TROY, NEW YORK

135th Year OF LEADERSHIP

RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE 1824

TROY N.Y. U.S. POSTAGE 03 : P.B. METER 380480